

REMARKS

In the patent application, claims 1-15 are pending. In the office action, all pending claims are rejected.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 13, and canceled claims 2, 8 and 14. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 2; claim 7 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 8; and claim 13 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 14.

No new matter has been introduced.

In the office action, all pending claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chew et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,664,991, hereafter referred to as *Chew*) in view of *Clark et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,101, hereafter referred to as *Clark*).

In rejecting claims 1, 7 and 13, the Examiner states that *Chew* discloses a series of operational steps including:

contacting the screen at the designated area by the physical object by pressing; and

keeping the physical object at the designated area longer than a selected time to cause the electronic device to provide the message (see col.1, lines 56 to col.2, line 9).

The Examiner also states that *Chew* discloses that tapping may cause selection of an entry (col.7, lines 1-8).

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 13 to include further limitations.

In rejecting claims 2, 8 and 14, the Examiner states that *Chew* discloses the step of “moving the physical object off the designated area while keeping the physical object substantially on the screen in order to end the message (col.4, lines 7-9).

In the final office action, the Examiner admits that tapping requires removing the physical object off the screen. However, the Examiner maintains that “touching”, as used with a

touch screen, can be carried out by dragging, which does not require removing the physical object off the screen.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. When a touch screen is used for allowing a user to touch a designated area in order to activate a function or to select an item, an electrical signal occurs as soon as the designated area is touched so as to cause the function to be activated or the item to be selected. This type of touch screen can be seen on an ATM (automated teller machine) or a PDA. In an electronic device using this type of touch screen, the signal in response to the touching occurs immediately regardless of whether the physical object is kept at the designated area. Thus, step 3 is lacking in the electronic device.

Another type of touch screen that is used in prior art is a tracking device commonly seen in a laptop computer, in lieu of a mouse. While this type of tracking device allows a user to reach an icon on a display screen and to active a function associated at that icon with subsequent touching. However, while the icon is displayed at a designated area on the display screen, the user does not interact with the icon using a physical object for touching or tapping purposes. Rather, the user uses a finger to touch a tracking device which is different from the display screen. Thus, this “tracking” type of touch screen is irrelevant to the invention as claimed.


For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 7 and 13, as amended, are clearly distinguishable over the cited *Chew* and *Clark* references.

As for claims 3-6, 9-12 and 15, they are dependent from claims 1, 7 and 13 and recite features not recited in claims 1, 7 and 13. For reasons regarding claims 1, 7 and 13 above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-6, 9-12 and 15 are also distinguishable over the cited *Chew* and *Clark* references.

CONCLUSION

As amended, claims 1, 3-7, 9-13 and 15 are allowable. Early allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth Q. Lao
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 40,061

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955